

Message

From: Gwinn, Maureen [gwinn.maureen@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/5/2017 10:20:28 PM
To: Bahadori, Tina [Bahadori.Tina@epa.gov]; Cascio, Wayne [Cascio.Wayne@epa.gov]; Thomas, Russell [Thomas.Russell@epa.gov]; Dix, David [Dix.David@epa.gov]; Deener, Kathleen [Deener.Kathleen@epa.gov]; Bussard, David [Bussard.David@epa.gov]; Axelrad, Daniel [Axelrad.Daniel@epa.gov]
CC: Kavlock, Robert [Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov]
Subject: REVISED: DUE BACK TO MAUREEN BY COB 2/8/17 RE: AJPH Editor Decision - Ms. No. AJPH-201618843 - Minor Revision
Attachments: Response to Review-AJPH.docx; Reframing Chemical Risk Assessment-121616notables-revised.docx; AJPH-S-16-03875.pdf; Reframing Risk Figure 2.pdf; Reframing Risk Figure 1.pdf; Table 1-rev.docx; Table 2.rev.docx

Hi all -

Please see the attached for revisions to the manuscript based on the review below, as well as a draft response to review comments. Digging deeper, we do not need to decrease tables or figures or words – although the EIC encouraged us to not make this too much longer.

I did not move the CVD example up in the text as requested by Reviewer #4. I tried to tee up that CVD would be discussed later. I don't think it helps the flow of the paper to move it up – so please consider that comment in particular and how you think we should address it.

Please note, this is due back to the journal by **2/10/17**. Sorry for the quick turnaround. I'm open to asking for an extension based on extenuating circumstances, as I did not get started on these revisions as early as planned due to everything going on at home. Please let me know if you feel that is something necessary and I will reach out.

I'm not sure that a meeting is necessary – but will look for a time next week if any of you feel the need.

EIC recommended we submit as an Analytical Essay: **Analytic Essays** provide critical analyses of public health issues. They have an unstructured abstract, up to 4000 words of text with subheadings, up to 4 table(s)+figure(s)+ image(s), and no more than 40 references. We are good on text length and figures/tables, but have 54 references and have been asked to add more. I can go through and cut back as you review the revisions, but suggestions welcome.

Thanks all – I'll look for your comments by **COB on Wednesday 2/8/17**.

Maureen R. Gwinn, PhD DABT ATS
Science Associate/IOAA

t(202)564-4621
m(703)434-9093

From: Gwinn, Maureen
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2017 8:20 PM
To: Bahadori, Tina <Bahadori.Tina@epa.gov>; Cascio, Wayne <Cascio.Wayne@epa.gov>; Thomas, Russell <Thomas.Russell@epa.gov>; Dix, David <Dix.David@epa.gov>; Deener, Kathleen <Deener.Kathleen@epa.gov>; Bussard, David <Bussard.David@epa.gov>; Axelrad, Daniel <Axelrad.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: AJPH Editor Decision - Ms. No. AJPH-201618843 - Minor Revision

Some good news today!

Largely favorable comments from the reviewers of our paper. I will start on revisions and send a draft to all for review (draft due to journal by 2/10 so will be quick turnaround). Please let me know if you have concerns about any of the comments below. They seem largely straightforward and should be easy to address. I will reach out to the EIC about the comment on number of tables and figures - we may need to discuss if we need to remove any of the existing tables or figures.

Pat yourself on the back, and stay tuned for a new version.

Maureen

Begin forwarded message:

From: em@editorialmanager.com
Date: January 20, 2017 at 11:49:40 AM EST
To: "Maureen R Gwinn" <gwinn.maureen@epa.gov>
Subject: **AJPH Editor Decision - Ms. No. AJPH-201618843 - Minor Revision**
Reply-To: <ajph.submissions@apha.org>

CC: mrg@rci.rutgers.edu

01/20/2017

Ref.: Ms. No. AJPH-201618843

A Public Health Perspective on 21st Century Risk Assessment
American Journal of Public Health

Dear Dr Maureen Gwinn,

I like this paper, and I hope it will be published. However, since the field of risk assessment has been core to my work for decades, I am going to throw back a suggestion to you that I think would make the paper more valuable. For me, the real message is not heart disease nor is it the history of risk assessment in the early days. As I read the paper, I am brought back to the conversation I had with a member of your informatics group. You are calling for the generation of new and much broader data, the publication and use of that data to consider impacts that we are close to be able to doing now that we could not do in the past. I, as one of the other reviewers suggested, would cut back the focus on heart disease because your approach can work for many others. I think a rewritten paper with this exciting new focus would be more interesting.

Should you accept this offer, please do the following:

1. Submit the revised paper at <http://ajph.edmgr.com/>. Log in as an Author and access the menu item titled, Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.
2. Incorporate --where apt--the issues raised in review. Because constraints on Journal space are severe, please strive to be concise, and do not increase the length of your paper.
3. Consult the Instructions for Authors and make the relevant

changes in the manuscript in terms of word count, table and figure format, etc.

<http://ajph.aphapublications.org/userimages/ContentEditor/1432646399120/authorinstructions.pdf>

4. Copy and paste a detailed point-by-point account of how you have responded to each critique of the original version into the Response to Reviewers section of the Submission Information page.

Your revision is due by 02/10/2017. After this deadline your paper will be temporarily withdrawn for 30 days, and definitely withdrawn after that unless we hear from you.

Many thanks for your valued contribution to the Journal,

Regards,

Michael Greenberg, associate editor, AJPH

EIC:

1. Submit the paper as an Analytic Essay, not as a Research paper
2. You will be charged \$300 for references in excess to 40.
3. Figure 2 is not mentioned in the text.

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #3: This is a manuscript describing an alternative framework for understanding the impact of environmental chemical exposure and disease. The example of cardiovascular disease is used to illustrate the complexity by which exposure to multiple environmental pollutants is associated with the onset and progression of atherosclerosis. This manuscript is well-written and convincing in arguing for a more comprehensive public health approach to assessing the risk of exposure to environmental chemicals. I suggest a few minor revisions to improve the manuscript.

1. The section that begins on line 49 could be expanded to better make the case that the current methods of predicting the health risks from chemical exposures are limited. It would be helpful to the reader to describe in more depth the challenges in predicting risk from chemical exposure, beyond the potential effect modification from the microbiome. First, from the perspective of industry and consumer safety organizations, there is the challenge of determining safety before a large population is exposed. However, there are methodological challenges in the downstream approach in which one determines the attributable risk of any specific environmental exposure in a population of individuals with a disease. More detail is needed in this section to better explain why novel approaches will more comprehensively and efficiently assess the health impact of environmental exposures.

2. Line 142 should be revised to soften the language on the proof of the relationship of air pollution exposure and atherosclerosis. Data are from one observational cohort using subclinical outcomes is supportive but not "unequivocal proof." I also encourage the author to cite more of the literature on cardiovascular disease and air pollution exposure.

Reviewer #4: This paper was quite well written and a joy to read. I learned a lot about traditional methods of chemical risk assessment that I did not know.

I would recommend that the authors give the example of cardiovascular disease more quickly in the article, and eliminate much of the abstract discussion of "disease." Having an example quickly can help to anchor the paper in the reader's mind. I would also advise that the text in the tables be shortened considerably, to no more than a few words per cell. Doing so will help the reader understand quickly the opportunities and challenges of different data sources, for example.

Reviewer #5: The authors present a revised model for chemical risk assessment that more clearly aligns with public health. The manuscript discussed challenges and opportunities of traditional risk assessment as well as the various types of existing data that could be incorporated into the proposed public health perspective for risk assessment. An adequate number of tables and figures were presented. I have no further suggestions.